

*******DRAFT MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review
Old & Historic Alexandria District
Wednesday, July 1, 2015
7:30pm, City Council Chambers, City Hall
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Members Present: John von Senden, Vice Chair
Chip Carlin
Margaret Miller
Christine Roberts
Wayne Neale
Kelly Finnigan
Christina Kelley

Staff Present: Planning & Zoning
Catherine Miliaras, Historic Preservation Planner
Al Cox, Historic Preservation Manager

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Acting Chairman John von Senden. Mr. von Senden welcomed Christina Kelley who was recently appointed to the OHAD BAR by City Council.

I. MINUTES

Consideration of the minutes from the June 17, 2015 meeting.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 6-0-1.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Finnigan, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review, approved the minutes of June 17, 2015 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0. Ms. Kelley abstained, as she was not present at the previous meeting.

II. NEW BUSINESS

1. CASE BAR2015-0170

Request for alterations at **817 S Royal St.**
Applicant: Bradford Seifert

BOARD ACTION: Deferred, 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR Case #2015-0170 due to improper notice. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

2

CASE BAR2015-0180

Request for alterations (historic warehouse) at **2 Duke St.**

Applicant: RTS Associates, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve of BAR Case #2015 0180, as amended.

The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. That the roof truss system be retained *in situ*.
2. That the applicant work with staff for final approval of historically appropriate mortar and brick infill where necessary.
3. That the applicant work closely with staff in the field when removing the existing non-historic façade to ensure that historic fabric that may not currently be known or visible is not lost during the rehabilitation.
4. That the applicant submit window specifications for painted wood windows that are in conformance with the BAR's adopted Performance Specifications, for final approval by staff.
5. That the applicant incorporate historic interpretation in the form of a plaque or marker that relates specifically to this historic warehouse.

SPEAKERS

Greg Shron, EYA, applicant, introduced the project and explained that they were currently in the process of applying for BAR Certificates of Appropriateness for the various buildings on the site.

Patrick Burkhart, Shalom Baranes Associates, project architect, reviewed the current proposal for the rehabilitation.

Ted Pulliam, 2506 Sanford Street, stated that the proposal did a good job with history and requested that historic interpretation be provided for this specific building, such as with a plaque or marker. Staff noted that a proposal for historic interpretation of the entire site would be brought to the Board at the next meeting.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Finnigan asked whether the sills and arches proposed to be bricked in would be retained as a ghost of the original features. Mr. Burkhart responded affirmatively. She stated support for the rehabilitation.

Mr. Carlin inquired whether the sliding doors would be on a track (yes, according to applicant). He noted that this building presented an opportunity for a mixed use area. He liked the canopy detailing above the entrances. He noted it was important to provide a comprehensive sign plan for the site, particularly to distinguish the more public areas from the residential sections. He asked that the stair design at the north entrance be refined so that the railings could be against the wall. Mr. Burkhart said he would look into it.

Ms. Kelley said that she thought it was a wonderful project and liked the entry canopies.

Mr. Neale said that the proposal was well-done but noted that the gutter/roof detail needed to be corrected in the wall sections to reflect the overhang.

Ms. Miller said that the architect had done a good job but was concerned that the other buildings might overshadow this building.

Ms. Roberts supported the project and made a motion to approve the application with the staff recommended conditions, as well as the addition of a condition about including an interpretive plaque or marker on the site. It was seconded by Mr. Neale.

Mr. von Senden inquired how the applicant would work with staff regarding the partial demolition and rehabilitation. Mr. Burkhart responded that they have hired a technical preservation team and will collaborate with staff. He also asked about whether there will be clear glazing for the glass canopy. Mr. Burkhart said it would have a light tint because completely clear glazing would get dirty but that it would be as clear as possible.

The BAR voted to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions noted above, 7-0.

REASON

The BAR supported the proposed rehabilitation of the building finding it appropriate and consistent with the Design Guidelines.

3 CASE BAR2015-0189

Request for new construction (building #1) at **2 Duke St.**
Applicant: RTS Associates, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Deferred, 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR Case #2015 0189. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

Item #3 & 4 were combined for discussion purposes.

4 CASE BAR2015-0190

Request for new construction (building #2) at **2 Duke St.**
Applicant: RTS Associates, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Deferred, 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR Case #2015 0190. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

SPEAKERS

Patrick Burkhart, Shalom Baranes Associates, project principal architect, reviewed the current proposal for the project and the key concepts from the past work sessions.

Joohan Kim, Shalom Baranes Associates, project architect, walked through the details of some project elements and responded to comments in the staff report.

Greg Shron, EYA, applicant, responded to questions and noted that significantly more detail would be forthcoming.

Dave Mallard, resident at Backyard Boats, strongly supported the design vocabulary and material choices. He liked a forward-looking project.

Bert Ely, co-chair of Friends of the Alexandria Waterfront, supported redevelopment but expressed concern about the appearance of the buildings from the river.

Philip Mews, South Henry Street resident, spoke in support of the project and the architect's design approach.

Corinne Marlowe, North Henry Street resident, spoke in support of the project.

Hal Hardaway, 311 South Union Street, opposed the design and requested that the project be deferred.

Ted Pulliam, 2506 Sanford Street, thought that the north elevation of Building 1 had an overly large stone wall that would not attract people from the park.

Susan Askew, 37 Wolfe Street, noted that the project should have retail that will survive.

Ann Shack, resident of Tobacco Quay, requested deferral of the project to get more information about the neighborhood context.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. von Senden requested that the applicant show more context as well as large-scale sections and plan excerpts.

Mr. Neale stated that Bob Youngentob had previously described a small "grain" that characterized Old Town and that the project would achieve that. Mr. Neale noted that large-scale buildings, like the Torpedo Factory, alienated the waterfront. He favored an eclectic approach that reflected the organic growth of smaller scale buildings. He thought the project was not integrated into the neighborhood. He noted that The Oronoco was able to be successful at a larger scale but that it was not really in Old Town. He still supported the site plan, general massing and density but was not fully supportive of the

general architectural character. He thought that his previous comments had not been incorporated into the current scheme. He thought the project was too strong a contrast to Old Town. He advocated for a smaller scale approach that looked like a seemingly random collection of vernacular buildings that had organically grown over time. He suggested using the party walls to separate individual “buildings.” He wanted greater variety of details, changes to roof slopes, more bays and oriel windows. He thought that the opportunity for change was now.

Ms. Miller noted that the proposal did not integrate the history and fiber of the community and was concerned it looked like it could be anywhere. She agreed with some of the comments made by Mr. Neale. She said that the concept review did not approve specific architectural elements. She agreed with Mr. Hardaway and found that the precedent images of Old Town buildings were not reflected in the design. She did not think that it necessarily had to be red brick. She thought that the east elevation drawing did not reflect the perspective rendering from the river shown during concept review.

Ms. Roberts suggested a deferral for many of the reasons already mentioned. She thought that the project was not shown in context properly and that it was shown as a bird’s eye view but should also show the street-level perspective, as it would be seen by a pedestrian. She thought that the two buildings needed more differentiation, as they still read as one building. She wanted to see defining characteristics for each building. She thought that the restaurant element at Building 1 was neither successful nor inviting. She did not think that some of the comments previously made had been incorporated. She thought that the design appeared too busy and false because there were too many visual support systems in the form of steel, brick and slate and that it needed to appear more “friendly.”

Ms. Kelley asked to see more context with the neighboring properties. She liked the design of the east elevations but agreed that the restaurant area needed additional work. She thought that a moderate amount of differentiation between buildings 1 & 2 could be good but should not be done in a way to lose the present rhythm of the east facade. She thought the entrances should be more grand, especially at the eateries and asked if it were possible to open up the kitchen area at the restaurant to make the north side of the building more welcoming from The Strand. She agreed with the staff comments for further study and deferral.

Mr. Carlin noted the applicant had done a good job so far on the project and had successfully made changes at the previous meetings on Building 3 to create a more human scale. He recommended that same approach here. He noted that Building 2 had long elevations and the scale should be reduced through articulation. Regarding the west elevation of Building 2, he liked the slate at the top but wanted to see more play and setbacks in the overall composition. He also suggested adding industrial overhangs. He recommended including OLIN in the discussion to redesign the blank wall on the north end of Building 1 to craft an appropriate terminus to the park along The Strand. He noted that the stone wall was an opportunity to interpret the site. He wanted the buildings to be more pedestrian friendly.

Ms. Finnigan agreed with Mr. Neale and wanted to see more variation. She liked seeing the extension of the parapet. She thought the buildings appeared too busy without achieving the desired variation. She wanted to see a rougher stone used. She recommended losing the horizontal “gap” between the stone base and brick upper portion on the west elevation of Building 1 because it diminished the load bearing masonry character of the building. She agreed that brick should be added to the south elevation of Building 2. She wanted the buildings to be friendlier, especially at the entrances.

Mr. von Senden requested that all plans be oriented the same way in the future. He also wanted to see the ground level views and not just bird’s eye view. He thought the lack of context was disconcerting. He cautioned against using CorTen in humid areas as it could cause staining. He thought that the overhangs should be unified and more clearly defined. He noted it was important to respect Alexandria’s bay tradition. He noted that he was expecting a more significant setback above 30 feet. He thought that there was too much gray in the color palette. He agreed that there should be further development of the entries.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the BAR voted to defer the project for further study, 7-0.

REASON

The Board found that the project needed further work and refinement, to differing extents. The Board requested that the project be presented in context with the neighboring properties and that street-level views were needed in place of bird’s eye views.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

5 CASE BAR2015-0049

A work session to discuss the proposed development project at **3640 Wheeler Ave.**

BOARD ACTION: The OHAD BAR held a work session to discuss the proposed development project at 3640 Wheeler Ave.

SPEAKER

Craig Pittinger, representing the applicant, spoke in support and answered questions.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts liked the project, particularly the way the mill race interpretive landscape feature had been used to incorporate access, so that the handicap ramp could be removed. She thought that the previous comments had all been addressed.

Ms. Miller supported the project.

Mr. Neale thought the project looked great. He suggested removing the arch at the third story windows and instead locating these at the second story to reflect traditional building design.

Ms. Finnigan thought the project looked fancy and new. Regarding the historic building, she asked that the aluminum siding and inappropriate canopy be removed. She said that they should limit puncturing the historic building and so there should be no separate lights for the hanging sign and these should be incorporated in the sign bracket.

Ms. Kelley requested that there be a historic marker for the mill building.

Mr. von Senden agreed with the change to the second and third story windows and wanted the canopy on the mill removed.

Mr. Carlin made a motion to endorse the height, scale, mass and architectural character with the following considerations:

1. The front signs should have illumination integral to the sign bracket and not wall mounted.
2. The aluminum siding on the gable ends of the building be replaced with wood and inappropriate canopy should be removed on the historic mill.
3. The arched windows on the new storage building shall be at the second story instead of the third story.
4. A historic marker shall be installed for the historic mill building.

Mr. Neale second the motion and it was supported unanimously, 7-0.

6 Election of Board of Architectural Review - Old and Historic District officers for Chairman and Vice Chairman.

BOARD ACTION: The OHAD BAR elected Mr. Neale as Chairman, 4-3, and Mr. Carlin as Vice Chairman, 4-1-2.

The BAR appointed Mr. Carlin to represent the BAR on the Old Town North Small Area Plan Advisory Group.

Mr. Cox updated the BAR on the 226 The Strand appeal. Mr. von Senden will represent the BAR at the City Council hearing on the appeal on September 12, 2015.

Mr. Cox noted that with new BAR members and other changes, it would be beneficial to have a retreat to go over policies and procedures, including a brief presentation from the City Attorney. The members suggested a Wednesday evening in September that was not a regular hearing date.

IV. DEFERRED PRIOR TO HEARING

CASE BAR2015-0171

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **217 N Pitt St.**

Applicant: Christine Jobes

CASE BAR2015-0184

Request for signage at **210 N Lee St.**

Applicant: Bridals by Natalie

The hearing was adjourned at 10:10 PM

Minutes submitted by,

Catherine Miliaras, Historic Preservation Planner
Board of Architectural Review

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS SINCE LAST MEETING

CASE BAR2015-0179

Request for fence repair at **902 Green St.**

Applicant: John Pinto

CASE BAR2015-0185

Request for siding replacement at **823 S Columbus St.**

Applicant: Robert and Cherry McConnell

CASE BAR2015-0186

Request for masonry repair at **1707 Duke St.**

Applicant: Vaughan Restoration

CASE BAR2015-0187

Request for window replacement at **35 Alexander St.**

Applicant: Robert Pass

CASE BAR2015-0188

Request for garage door and light fixture replacement at **103 Quay St.**

Applicant: Kevin and Nancy Petit

CASE BAR2015-0193

Request for window replacement at **56 Wolfe St.**

Applicant: Charles Percy

CASE BAR2015-0196

Request for signage at **605 Franklin St.**

Applicant: Patina

CASE BAR2015-0199

Request for window repair at **305 Duke St.**

Applicant: Candace Clary

CASE BAR2015-0203

Request for brick repointing at **225 N Fairfax St.**

Applicant: Barbara Charles